(2) Section 35 (*a*) may be so amended as to enable the Courts admitting unstamped documents in evidence by giving them the discretion as above proposed. The amendment may be made by inserting the words "of any sum not exceeding ten times" in place of "of a sum equal to ten times" in the penultimate line of the section.

Reply of Government.—The reasons adduced are not sufficient to alter the existing law.

SUBJECT No. 21.

Amildars to be empowered to try Civil cases.

Messrs. Tuppada Viranna of Challakere Taluk and Shanbhog Hanumantappa, District Board Member, Chitaldrug.

Summary of discussion.—Prior to the establishment of the Munsiffs' Courts in the State, the Amildars were empowered to try all cases of a Civil nature relating to Revenue matters, which was of great advantage to the Agricultural population. The present system of resorting to Munsiffs' Courts has caused them unnecessary annoyance and trouble. It is requested that the former system may be revied.

Reply of Government.—It is not possible to do so.

SUBJECT No. 22.

The Small Causes Regulation

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, B. A., LL. B., Advocate, Shimoga Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The Draft Regulation styled "The Mysore Small Causes Regulation" may be passed into law. This will settle many doubtful questions as to the jurisdiction of Small Cause Courts.

Reply of Government.—This Regulation is now before Government, and will be taken up soon for consideration.

SUBJECT No. 23.

Amendment of the Regulation of Refunds.

Mr. B. Mailaraiya of Seringapatam.

Summary of discussion.—Amendment of the provision of the Regulation about refund of half the stamp in non-contested civil cases struck off the file as compromised out of Court, and reported by plaintiff, is prayed for.

Reply of Government.—The opinion of the Chief Court will be asked for.

SUBJECT No. 24

Amendment of the Legal Practitioners' Regulation.

Messrs. B. Milaraiya of Seringapatam; Balavanta Rao, Arsikere Taluk; and Varada Iyengar, Hassan Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Amendment of the Legal Practitioners' Regulation by doing away with the distinction between 1st and 2nd grade pleaders, or extending the practice of the 2nd grade pleaders to Subordinate Judges' Courts, on the original and small cause sides, is proposed.

Reply of Government.—This is not possible. Government have more than once declined to extend the provisions of the Regulation in this respect.

SUBJECT No. 25.

Amendment of the Inam Revenue Code.

(*a*) Mr. Jahgirdar Madappa of Mysore.
(*b*) Mr. M C. Ranga Iyengar, Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) According to the Land Revenue Code, Section 54, the land revenue on Government occupied land is the paramount charge on the holding. But many Judges are of opinion that it is doubtful whether that rule is applicable to Inam lands. As the Chief Court has decided that the revenue due to an Inamdar for an Inam land is not the paramount charge on the holding, it is requested that that section of the Code may be so amended as to make it applicable to Inam lands.

(*b*) The rent payable by an inferior holder to a superior holder in an alienated holding be made an first charge